

REMARKS

As the Examiner has indication in the Advisory Action that the claims submitted on the paper filed by Applicant on May 31, 2005 would be entered upon the filing of an Appeal Brief. Applicant files amended claims as set forth herein above and argues in favor of the amended claims as previously presented assuming that they were not entered as no Appeal Brief has been filed.

In response to the Response to Arguments section of the Advisory Action at page 2, paragraph 2, Applicant argues in favor of the invention as now set forth in the amended claims by submitting that the present invention is believed to be patentably distinguishable over the prior art references of record as the claimed method recites that “at the time of forming two or more colors of the light emitting layers by the printing method, the coated part is covered with a protective material in a form of a film after solidifying all the light emitting layer forming coating solutions printed preliminarily, and then the subsequent light emitting layer forming coating solution is printed by the printing method using the intaglio.” The light emitting layers such as the one having different light emitting colors are formed by an intaglio printing after the coated part is covered with a protected material in a film form. Therefore, the present invention enables the formatting a thin and even new light emitting layer without damaging the light emitting layer preliminarily printed.

In contrast, US Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0003397 (hereinafter ‘397) discloses a method of forming an EL layer by screen printing. The claimed method is disclosed and claimed as providing a printing method which includes the disposing of a screen with holes in pattern form formed thereof onto a surface of a substrate to scrape off the ink into the holes while moving a resin blade referred to as a “squeegee” so as to contact the screen. With this

understanding of the '397 reference, the screen printing method of this reference is completely different from the intaglio printing method of the present invention as set forth and claimed as the claimed method the light emitting layer being printed after covering the coated part with a film-form protective material. Moreover, the '397 reference discloses that in the claimed screen printing method, it is necessary to scrape off the ink by moving the squeegee while simultaneously applying thereto a predetermined pressure to the screen. This scraping step or procedure is undesirable and taught away from in view of the '397 disclosure as unnecessary stress will be applied to the coated part covered with the screen when the squeegee moves on the screen. This unnecessary stress or pressure might well result in damaging the coated part. The present invention brings improvement to the art as the method has the effect of forming a new light emitting layer without the possibility of damaging the coated part by any means including a pressured squeegee scraping step therefore eliminating the possibility of any screen printing damage to the coated part. The '397 reference is respectfully submitted to be distinguishable at least for this reason, and for this reason it is submitted that the reference should no longer continue to affect the patentability of the claimed method.

Furthermore, the U.S. patent application publication designated '252, after careful review and consideration is submitted not to either explicitly nor implicitly disclose the recited required features of the claimed method. The claimed method requires that "at the time of forming two or more colors of the light emitting layers by the printing method, the coated part is covered with a protective material in a form of a film after solidifying all the light emitting layer forming coating solutions printed preliminarily, and then the subsequent light emitting layer forming coating solution is printed by the printing method using the intaglio."

As this last reference is deficient with respect to this feature, it is also submitted that this reference is deficient as being maintained to sustain an obviousness objection.

Furthermore, as not one reference above encloses all of the features of the present invention and there is no legally permissible means (explicit or implicit) for combining these references, the previously raised obviousness objection(s) are believed to be overcome.

In view of all of the aforesaid, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of the instant method as now amended and claimed.

In the event there are some further issues outstanding which might be able to be dealt with telephonically, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants undersigned representative at the phone number provided.

Date:

2/9/06

Respectfully Submitted,

Timothy J. Keefer, Reg. No. 35,567

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
55 East Monroe Street
Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803
Telephone: (312) 346-8000
Facsimile: (312) 269-8869